Pages 1 - 35

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP, JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS. No. CR 18-009 WHA

AMIR BAKHTIARI,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Tuesday, October 29, 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: DAVID L. ANDERSON

United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: BENJAMIN KINGSLEY

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

For Defendant: BOERSCH & ILLOVSKY LLP

1611 Telegraph Avenue, Suite 806

Oakland, California 94612

BY: MARTHA BOERSCH, ESQ.

Also Present: Jill Spitalieri, U.S. Probation

Mr. Peter Sonnen

Reported By: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR No. 5812, RMR, CRR

Official Reporter

1 Tuesday - October 29, 2019 2:01 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling criminal action 18-009 and 4 criminal action 19-127, United States versus Amir Bakhtiari. 5 Counsel, please step forward and state your appearances for the 6 7 record. MR. KINGSLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 8 Kingsley for the United States. 9 THE COURT: Welcome. 10 MS. BOERSCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Martha 11 12 Boersch for Mr. Bakhtiari, who is present. THE COURT: Welcome to you. 13 Mr. Bakhtiari, welcome to you. 14 MS. SPITALIERI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 15 Jill 16 Spitalieri with U.S. Probation. 17 THE COURT: Okay. We're here for sentencing. Mr. Bakhtiari, did you read the presentence report? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: You did. Are there any unresolved 21 objections? 22 MS. BOERSCH: No, I don't think so, Your Honor. I had 23 an objection to the restitution amount, but I think I've resolved that. 24 25 THE COURT: Great. How about by the Government?

MR. KINGSLEY: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. So this is a little complicated. The guidelines, as calculated, are offense level 27, criminal 3 history number I; correct? Which translates to 70 to 87 months 4 5 according to the guidelines. The probation officer recommends 36 months on Count One 6 and 60 months on Count Two, concurrent, for a total of 60 7 months; right? 8 9 MS. SPITALIERI: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: The Government recommends 70 months. 10 11 (Emergency alarm sounds. Proceedings in recess from 2:03 12 p.m. to 2:25 p.m.) Please be seated. Let's resume with 13 THE COURT: Mr. Bakhtiari's case. I apologize for the interruption. 14 was a fire drill we knew about, but we didn't know it would be 15 continuous noise. We were told we could go ahead with the 16 hearing. Unfortunately, they didn't tell us the noise would 17 interfere. Anyway, now it looks like it's all clear, so we 18 19 To resummarize, the guideline range is 27-I, will continue. 20 which corresponds to 70 to 87 months. PSR recommends 60, the 21 Government 70, defendant 36. 2.2 So we will now have argument and then elocution.

So, Ms. Boersch, you may go first.

23

24

25

MS. BOERSCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

I recognize that we've asked for a significant variance

from the recommended guideline range, but given Mr. Bakhtiari's immigration circumstances that are going to result in him serving a significantly harsher and longer sentence than a U.S. citizen defendant in his position, I think it's warranted. That along with his family situation and the fact that at the end of the day he's going to be deported to Iran, a country that he has not lived in for over 30 years.

I want to talk about three things. First is the collateral consequences of this conviction, quite apart from any sentence of imprisonment.

The second is the disparity that would result if he were to receive the sentences recommended by the Government or Probation because of the fact of his immigration status.

And the third thing I want to address is the Government's notion that a long sentence of imprisonment is necessary for general deterrence.

As to the first point, the collateral consequences, there's collateral consequences in every criminal case. I recognize that. But I think they're severe here, and it's tied up with his family circumstances and his immigration status.

He has -- this investigation started back in 2016, when his employer started an internal investigation. He was fired from his job. He lost his job. He's been unemployed since.

The conviction alone will result in permanent loss of his career and likely any chance that he'll be able to get a job or

much of a job in the future.

He's already lost his home. The home has been sold. The portion that he owned of the equity has been turned over to the government. His family has lost any financial security because he is or was the sole breadwinner and his wife was a stay-at-home mother.

The most important thing to me is, given his immigration circumstances he is going to lose the relationship with his wife, perhaps permanently, and most importantly the relationship he has with his two boys, 7-year-old and 4-year-old sons who he has been primarily caring for since 2016. His deportation in Iran will essentially end his family relationship. They are citizens of the United States. They do not speak Farsi.

The State Department advises against travel to Iran. And so it's unlikely, if he's deported, which is likely, if he's deported to Iran that he'll really ever be able to see his family again because he won't be able to come back into the United States.

In addition to that, because, again, of his immigration status he faces essentially an indeterminate period of time in custody because once he serves whatever term of imprisonment this court imposes he will be placed into immigration custody, into an ICE detention facility, for an indeterminate amount of time, particularly because he's deportable to Iran, a country

with which we do not have diplomatic relationships. So it's much more difficult, it takes much longer to deport people in that circumstance. And I've cited to some authority for that in my sentencing memo. In addition to that, in addition to all of that, he is obviously subject to some significant financial penalties which he has already made an effort to try to repay.

And, finally, there's ongoing civil litigation against both himself and his wife. And his wife and family will have to deal with that for however much longer that will have to go on.

So those are enormous collateral consequences, putting aside any term of imprisonment. And I think those need to be taken into account if the Court is considering that one of the purposes of sentencing is to provide some sort of a general deterrence. And I think these collateral consequences certainly do.

On the disparity, and I run through this in the sentencing memo, but because he is a deportable alien he will not qualify for a minimum security facility. But for his immigration status he would qualify for Lompoc or Taft except they've shut down Taft.

As a result, he will be placed in at least a low security facility. Those, as I've explained in my sentencing memo, are much more onerous places of imprisonment than a camp.

Besides that, because he's an illegal alien, given an

order of President Trump, and I think it was January of 2018, President Trump has now ordered that all foreign citizen male defendants be housed in for-profit prisons rather than BOP facilities.

And there's been several studies that have shown, including one in 2016 by the OIG, that for-profit prisons are much worse places to be incarcerated. The rate of security incidences are much higher; there's significant safety issues with food, with the nature of the conditions in those prisons.

So he's most likely to be put in a for-profit prison and subject to much harsher conditions.

Because of his immigration status, he will not be eligible for any of the early release programs that BOP offers to every other white collar defendant.

He will not be eligible for release to an RRC. He will not be eligible for any of the First Step programs. And he will not be eligible for early release to home detention.

As a result of all that, he will be subject to at least a period of detention of 22 months longer than any other citizen defendant in his position with the same laws and the same Sentencing Guidelines.

And that's because he also is not going to be eligible for the good-time credits. So that's ten months there and then another 12 months, potentially, given the potential for someone else for release to a halfway house or a home detention.

And then finally, again, is the ICE detention following any term of imprisonment for this offense which can be, as I said, indeterminate. And the ICE detention facilities, as numerous studies have shown, are deplorable and even worse than those in a for-profit prison.

So because of that and because of his family circumstances and the collateral consequences, I think that a 36-month sentence is a fair sentence here, given the offense, given the guideline range, and given the fact that another defendant in his position, who is not a foreign citizen, would ultimately end up serving approximately that amount of time.

The Government has asked for a longer sentence relying primarily on general deterrence. But there's really no empirical evidence that shows that a longer term of imprisonment results in a greater degree of general deterrence. Rather, it's the certainty of punishment that provides some general deterrence to the public.

So the length of the term of imprisonment is not what provides general deterrence. And, in addition, as I mentioned before, general deterrence, I think in this case, is adequately served by all the collateral consequences that I've already discussed.

So given the Court's and Congress's instruction to the Court to impose a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to fulfill the goals of sentencing, I think a

sentence of 36 months is more than adequate given this case and the defendant's circumstances.

THE COURT: How much of the embezzled money has been paid back to the victim?

MS. BOERSCH: None of it -- it's all in the custody of the United States at the moment. I think so far -- I was talking to Mr. Kingsley about this. There's enough money to pay back the IRS. But the IRS is second in line. So if the IRS is owed, I think, 1.2 million or something, that's how much has been collected so far.

And, in addition, there's the forfeiture. And the value of the forfeited items is another several hundred thousand. I don't know exactly.

And I would note, to the extent --

THE COURT: Is Mr. Bakhtiari going to try to avoid being deported? You make it sound like it's a sure thing.

MS. BOERSCH: I think it is pretty much of a sure thing. And he doesn't know, at this point, whether or not -- I don't think he can avoid it. Whether he can try to challenge it or not, we don't know yet. I mean --

THE COURT: Does he have an immigration lawyer?

MS. BOERSCH: He did have one. He's looking for another one.

THE COURT: You say he would go into ICE detention, but I see cases all the time where the deportee is out on bail

```
1
     pending many years of immigration court proceedings.
                                                           So is it
 2
     a certainty that he'll be in custody, or is that unknown?
             MS. BOERSCH: It's unknown, I think. But it's a
 3
     significant risk, particularly given that he's deportable to
 4
     Iran.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kingsley.
 6
             MR. KINGSLEY: Your Honor, Peter Sonnen, who is one of
 7
     the owners of Sonnen Motorcars is here.
 8
              THE COURT:
                         Where is he?
 9
             MR. KINGSLEY: He is sitting in the front row.
10
          Would the Court like him to speak now or after?
11
12
              THE COURT: Let's have his statement now, and you get
     to follow it, and then I'll give Counsel another opportunity to
13
     reply to that.
14
15
         Let's have him speak now.
              MR. KINGSLEY: Thank you.
16
17
                         Welcome. Please come up here to the
              THE COURT:
     microphone and tell us what your name is.
18
19
          Please, go ahead.
20
              MR. SONNEN: My name is Peter Sonnen.
21
     president and CEO from Sonnen Motorcars. And I made a few
22
     notes to tell you how I look the whole situation. Very short.
23
     I don't want to do too much.
              THE COURT: Go ahead, please. Take your time.
24
25
             MR. SONNEN: Okay. I thank you for allowing me to
```

speak up here what I experience, what I am saying, and provide a brief statement.

I thank the U.S. Attorney, the DOJ, and the IRS attorneys and staff for pursuing and investigating Bakhtiari's wrongdoing and bringing him to justice.

It is hard to put it in words or describe how this whole ordeal has affected myself, my family, and the people I've worked with on a daily basis other than to say it has been devastating. I trusted Bakhtiari, and he not only violated that trust in every way, shape and form, his conduct was manipulative, threatening, calculated, and despicable.

This was not an isolated event. It took place over an extended period of time and involved many players and resulted in the theft of millions of dollars from me and my business.

I will never recover from this, ever. In short, the man is evil. And I respectfully request that Your Honor sentence him to the maximum time under the guidelines. He deserves significant jail time.

He should know that I will continue our effort to seek full restitution from him of the millions he has stolen, with the aid of his cohort in crime until I can recover every cent.

Your Honor, that's my victim impact statement. Thank you for considering it.

The last important thing I would like to mention is that let's not forget for one moment that this man is capable of --

what this man is capable of, and that Bakhtiari used threats, fear, and intimidation of my employees in order to achieve his purposes. That disturbs me deeply that good people who I employed were treated in such a manner.

Let's not provide him with a full opportunity to ever do this again. Put him away, please. This guy was so bad he threatened my employees. He thought he was part owner of my dealership. If he say one word, he fired them right away. And people were afraid to say anything.

I was surprised that that could be happen, that people not come to me because they had to go relationship with them and tell them what bothers them. And people disappeared, and I didn't know it.

And one of my top manager, he quit. And he came later back with his wife to me and said, "I'm very sorry, but I could not stand it anymore, and I was afraid about this guy." So his main tool were fear and threatening.

And, also, he hurt my image. I have neighbor right next to me. The owner came to me, sent me a letter and said, "Mr. Sonnen, this is unheard of how your general manager behaves." She has fiance, and he treated him, she said, like dirt. And he expect from me payment to him for making that up. I pay the guy \$10,000 to eliminate that. Bakhtiari didn't care about it. I told him that he even doesn't want to talk about it.

It is a guy he has a character that is so black and so deep. In my 60 years, almost, as a businessman -- I had business in Germany that was not small and had business here and never met a guy like Bakhtiari. He is dangerous. The guy is really, really dangerous in business.

If the guy went to war, I would not be in his Army, you know. It's bad. It's really, really bad. I'm sorry to say it, but it's the truth.

Thank you very much for my time. I appreciate that.

I could tell you many stories. Afterwards came people and told me stories about him. I mean, what I tell you is the thing is really heavy. He can destroy a company. He can destroy your image. He can do so much harm to a business and specifically car business. That's really bad.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Kingsley.

MR. KINGSLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

I just want to go back a little bit to the offense for a moment. I think the Court is very familiar with it. I want to point out -- and Ms. Boersch is an excellent lawyer, and I know why she did it -- spent almost no time talking about what Mr. Bakhtiari did, none whatsoever, and almost nothing about him personally, and instead his family and his immigration status.

And the reason for that is because the crime here is unexplainable. It's about the worst type of white collar crime you can commit. It's lying to people's faces for years in order to steal money to fund a lavish lifestyle. And there's nothing about him personally or the way he committed this offense or his motives for it that add up to a mitigating factor.

I think the Court heard from Mr. Sonnen and can see from the victim impact statement but also from the other cases in front of the defendant and the broad fact pattern how Mr. Bakhtiari sucked all of these other people into his scheme, whether they were codefendants in this case, because the Government can prove that they knew what was going on, or they didn't know for whatever reason.

This was a long thing that involved lying and manipulating a lot of people for a really long time. And it's really bad.

And 36 months is far too low for something like that.

I want to talk a little bit about the collateral consequences that Ms. Boersch has pointed to with the broad point that those are really his fault. He knew that he had a small family when he was doing this. He didn't steal the money to feed his kids. He stole it, you know, to go to Vegas and spend money on himself mostly. And he knew the risk that, as he was doing this, that he would go to jail and never see his kids while he was in jail or that he would be deported.

It's hard to sit here today and listen to an argument by somebody who knew all of those things while this was happening and now asks for a substantial reduction in the sentence because of something that was fully within his power for the last seven years. This isn't some unexpected circumstance.

And I sympathize with his family, but they're his victims more than they are anything else. And it's his fault that this is happening to them.

With respect to deportation, I agree with the Court entirely that that is a completely uncertain process.

Ms. Boersch's sentencing memo lays out facts that a good immigration lawyer could presumably spin into an asylum or withholding of removal claim or possibly a convention against torture claim.

I don't know. I'm not an immigration attorney. But I don't think anybody sitting here today can predict whether he's going to go into ICE custody and whether he will necessarily be deported.

And if he has a good claim, he should make that claim.

Given his family's relationship to the government of the Shaw,
maybe he shouldn't go back to Persia. That's -- or to Iran.

That's an immigration issue that has nothing to do with what's
before this court, and I don't think the Court can assess it on
this record in a way that allows the Court to take it into
account.

There's also a bit of an inconsistency there, in the argument that he needs to see his family and so he should get a shorter prison sentence, but then once he's out he's immediately going to go into ICE custody and get deported anyway.

I don't know how the Court is supposed to weigh those things, and I don't really think the immigration status cuts in favor of a shorter sentence for that reason.

On the type of custody, I think we are -- it is a black hole for this court to try to sentence people based on predictions on the sort of hardness or quality of the time that they're going to serve at sentencing.

BOP needs to have the ability to make classifications based on all types of factors, and it does so. But I don't know why the Court -- why it would be appropriate for the Court to consider it just in this case and not in literally every single other case where there's some ability to guess at what type of designation somebody is going to have and take that into account.

I don't think we can reliably do that in every case. I don't think 3553 tells the Court to do that. And I think it results in a set of arbitrary distinctions at sentencing.

I'm not sure why it would be the case that because

Mr. Bakhtiari is deportable he should get half the sentence of
an American citizen who is presumably not going to go to a low

security facility, is going to go to a minimum security facility instead. We just don't know what's going to happen.

For general deterrence, I think -- I know this court has said it before. It is by far the most important factor, but it's not the only factor here.

I think there is a significant aspect in a case like this that needs to simply take into account the pathological conduct of a defendant. The way the defendant committed his crime, the length of time that he committed his crime, and the reasons he it did, and the impact on the victim. Those are things that matter at sentencing. Those don't go to general deterrence, and they're relevant.

I do think general deterrence is extraordinarily important. I think there's a lot of people in this world that would take \$7 million in exchange for 36 months in a federal prison. I don't know. It doesn't seem like nearly enough time to deter that amount of misconduct.

THE COURT: What do you think happened to all that money?

MR. KINGSLEY: I think Mr. Bakhtiari -- well, we've recovered some of it. I think he spent a lot of it.

I've seen the American Express card statement that Austin
Caba paid with embezzled funds, and it's just day-to-day lavish
living. Clothes, personal -- you know, hand bags, watches,
expensive artwork, restaurants, travel.

In my experience, most white collar defendants spend their money as it comes in. And I don't think Mr. Bakhtiari is that different except that he also was being paid over \$300,000 a year by Mr. Sonnen and was able to save some of it in IRAs for his family members or put the money into his house. But he spent it on the sort of stuff that white collar defendants often spend their money on.

THE COURT: Have the other defendants been sentenced?

I can't remember.

MR. KINGSLEY: No. The other two defendants are cooperating, and they have not been sentenced yet.

And I should say, in the Government's view, they are both considerably less culpable than Mr. Bakhtiari, both in terms of their role.

He was the mastermind of this operation, and they were brought in for periods of time for a portion of it and benefited such a small amount compared to the amount that he benefited in the scheme.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, Probation. Normally, this would be a -- in addition to prison time, a fine. But you recommend no fine, and yet he has retained counsel. And he embezzled, by his own admission, many millions. So are you sure he hasn't got the money to pay a fine?

MS. SPITALIERI: Your Honor, like he said, the money that he took in, it does appear that he just spent it as he

took it in.

And Probation weighs the restitution as a priority. So we wanted that to get paid back quickly. And then after the \$8 million is paid back, there's probably -- if it gets paid back, there won't be much left.

Because, like she said, he will probably eventually get deported, he's not going to have a job, and we just held the restitution to be a priority.

MR. KINGSLEY: Your Honor, I think the Government -Mr. Bakhtiari has worked with the Government through his
counsel to deal with his assets. And I think it's an important
part of this case.

And that is one of the reasons I'm asking for the low end of the guidelines, is that we worked out an agreement to basically, for his assets, what he has left in his name and not his family's assets, sign them over to the Government for use in restitution.

THE COURT: The restitution goes to who?

MR. KINGSLEY: It's going to go to Sonnen Motorcars.

THE COURT: First?

MR. KINGSLEY: First, entirely, because the Sonnen

Motorcars restitution number is more than I expect

Mr. Bakhtiari would ever pay. So I don't -- the IRS is never going to get paid by Mr. Bakhtiari.

THE COURT: So how much of restitution money is there

already?

MR. KINGSLEY: I think Ms. Boersch is about right,
1.2 million, 1.3 million approximately. There's a bunch of
individual items that will need to be auctioned off, like
watches and artwork, but that's of 6.8 -- 6.5, 6.8 million,
6.6 million in Sonnen Motorcars' restitution amount.

THE COURT: What is the nationality of Mr. Sonnen?

MR. KINGSLEY: Mr. Sonnen is from Germany.

THE COURT: All right. So there was no family relationship there?

MR. KINGSLEY: No.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

Ms. Boersch, you should have an opportunity to respond to what the victim said and, if you wish, to what Mr. Kingsley said.

MS. BOERSCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

With respect to the offense conduct, I do want to respond briefly to that. I didn't address it because he has pled guilty. He admitted to the facts that are in the presentence report. We don't dispute those. And what he did is undeniably bad. I don't think it's -- I think there's many other white collar cases where there's this sort of conduct. But it's undeniably bad. We don't dispute it. He pled guilty. He accepted responsibility for it. And, clearly, it was motivated by greed.

So from my perspective, that's all a given. And the question now is, what is a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to deal with this offense given all of the circumstances here?

And it's not just that he'll be deported at the end of this. It's that the conditions of his confinement are going to be longer and worse than another defendant.

This is not the first court that has faced this issue.

Judge Breyer faced the same issue in the *Hussain* case, and granted a significant downward variance, as a result, from 144 months down to 60 months, because that defendant, who was a UK citizen, was subject to all of these problems.

And just last week Judge Colleen McMahon, in the Southern District of New York, granted a fairly significant downward departure -- downward variance for Conrad Black in the Libor trading case for the exact same reasons. And before she imposed sentence --

THE COURT: What, again, is the reason that he will not get a camp?

MS. BOERSCH: Because of the BOP regulations that specify that no -- anybody who's a noncitizen must be housed in at least a low security facility and not a minimum security facility.

But for that he would be, under the BOP table where you calculate someone's points, he would be eligible for a camp.

1 That's in my sentencing memo. He has essentially zero points 2 or one or two points. So that automatically takes him out of 3 the camp territory. So it's those issues that make this case different. 4 it's those issues that both Judge Breyer and Judge McMahon 5 thought created significant disparity between the sentences 6 7 that the defendants in those cases or here would face compared to a defendant who was a citizen of the United States. 8 So I'm not --9 THE COURT: Did Judge Breyer put the downward 10 departure solely on that ground? 11 12 MS. BOERSCH: I believe it was solely if not primarily 13 on that ground. Is that right? 14 THE COURT: MS. BOERSCH: I mean, he had a lot -- Mr. Hussain had 15 a lot of other --16 17 MR. KINGSLEY: I don't think that was the only ground for the variance. But I haven't reviewed the sentencing 18 19 transcript, so I don't want to speculate on it. 20 THE COURT: He went from 144 to what? 21 MS. BOERSCH: Five years. MR. KINGSLEY: And the Court will recall that was an 22 23 accounting fraud case with a totally different set of facts

than an embezzlement case where the defendant is embezzling

24

25

directly from a person.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MS. BOERSCH: You know, I just -- I don't know if the
Court remembers, but you had another case that's not too
dissimilar from this, where the Court imposed a 14-month
sentence on Larry Goldfarb, who was a
6-and-a-half-million-dollar fraud. Same thing.
embezzling from his fund. There was a parallel SEC civil
proceeding. And at the end of the day, he had -- he was a U.S.
citizen, but he had other mitigating factors and received a
14-month sentence and is now out and doing fine.
     So my point is simply that the immigration issues related
to Mr. Bakhtiari and other defendants like Mr. Hussain create a
situation in which they're necessarily going to do a longer and
harsher sentence than someone else in their position who's a
U.S. citizen.
    And I think the Court has to take that into account.
I think I've done that in my sentencing memo.
        THE COURT:
                    Wait. Is it true that he will not get
credit for good time served?
        MR. KINGSLEY: I don't know if that's true, but I take
Ms. Boersch on her word on that.
         THE COURT: Does Probation know?
        MS. SPITALIERI: I believe he gets credit, but not in
the way that a citizen would. So he would get the credit and
go into ICE custody.
        MR. KINGSLEY: So if he went into ICE custody --
```

MS. SPITALIERI: It's at the 80 percent marker. 1 2 That's my understanding. So it would still be custody, but I'm not a hundred percent certain on that. 3 THE COURT: Ms. Boersch, what do you say is the 4 situation? What is the exact rule on credit for time served? 5 MS. BOERSCH: You know, that was -- let me look, 6 because I cannot remember now. 7 MS. SPITALIERI: And then my understanding is that ICE 8 custody is unknown. He could be released, as you said, for 9 years with just having to report to ICE every few months or 10 annually, or he could be held for an indeterminate amount of 11 12 time. MS. BOERSCH: And, Your Honor, I don't recall, it was 13 in the -- Exhibit E, which was attached to my sentencing memo, 14 was a declaration filed in the Hussain matter. I just don't 15 recall. 16 MR. KINGSLEY: I think, Your Honor -- I mean, I think 17 this is part of the reason why this is such a dangerous road to 18 Every single defendant can second-quess BOP's reasons 19 for classifying them in a particular way. 20 I have had cases in front of this court with white collar 21 22 defendants who were not low-level designations and did not get 23 sent to camps. That happens all the time. And for the Court to sit here and try to figure out 24 whether what BOP is doing warrants a variance, because it's not 25

really something that you take into account under 3553, I don't know how we do that.

THE COURT: Judge Breyer is famous. He's on the Sentencing Commission. He ought to know better than the rest of us what the -- what the right thing to do is.

What do you say to that Hussain case?

MR. KINGSLEY: I think that we would have to sit down and look at the records in that case to figure out the individual circumstances of that defendant, of his crime, of the comparable sentences for people who commit accounting fraud, and weigh it in that way.

I think it's very dangerous for any of us to sit here and look at totally different defendants on totally different cases and try to figure out whether that's a fair comparison.

I also think -- I mean, our office vigorously opposed that particular argument in that case, and I think Judge Breyer was wrong to the extent he considered it.

The defendant does not have a right to go to a camp. And one of the main criticisms of the justice system is that white collar defendants are given slaps on the wrists and sent to camps. He doesn't have a right to it.

MS. BOERSCH: So --

THE COURT: Tell me more about his mental condition and Alzheimers and that. I read that in your paperwork, but you didn't mention it this time.

MS. BOERSCH: That is one of the factors, Your Honor.

And Mr. Bakhtiari has been granted disability by the Social Security Administration, and his driver's license has been suspended because of what -- it's not completely diagnosed yet, but either early onset dementia or Alzheimers. He's had some significant mental issues. I don't know if the Court recalls, but we had to put off a change of plea several times as a result.

He's currently in treatment. He's undergoing some stem cell replacement therapy, which is sort of new treatment, potential treatment for it. And that is ongoing. That treatment obviously he won't get in any Bureau of Prisons or any other facility. So that, I think, is another factor that has to be considered.

But to get back to Mr. Kingsley's point that the Court shouldn't be considering what BOP is doing, I disagree with that. I think under 3553 the Court has to consider what is going to happen to this defendant. And the question is, what is an appropriate sentence for this defendant?

And as to his point that -- and this is not -- you know, it's very clear, if you read my sentencing memo it's very clear how this will work given his immigration status.

As to Mr. Kingsley' point, "Well, we can't be comparing one defendant to another," well, we do that all the time.

That's the whole point of looking to see if the sentence is

disparate or not. So you have to.

And then the final point I want to make, and this is a philosophical point, but if you look at the sentences over the last 20 or 30 years, the length of the terms of imprisonment have gone up dramatically.

And we're at a point that because of the guidelines, the fraud guidelines in particular, we seem to be sending everybody to prison for six or seven years. First time offenders, who have never done anything before in their lives, who since the offense have not done anything wrong.

And I really question the wisdom of that to begin with.

THE COURT: No, no. At least in this courtroom most of the sentences are much less than that. Some of them are that high, that's true, but not a majority.

MS. BOERSCH: I appreciate that, Your Honor. And I have had several cases in front of you where that was true.

And I think that's absolutely the right approach, particularly now that the guidelines are not mandatory.

And as to Mr. Bakhtiari's character, I mean, he has been very quiet here because he knows this was a bad offense and he accepts responsibility for it. And he feels badly about it. But if you read the character reference letters, he's a generous man and he's a loving family man. Did he commit a bad crime? Yes, he did. Did he suffer from a serious lapse of judgment that extended for a long period of time? Yes, he did.

But, at the end of the day, does he really need to spend 70 months in jail and then be deported to Iran for an offense that is not that atypical from many of the offenses that -- in this building, many other sort of white collar offenses?

And I appreciate the Court has a very difficult job. It is a very difficult job. But that's, at the end of the day, what has to be decided.

And I just ask for the Court to consider the disparate effect that a term of imprisonment is going to have on Mr. Bakhtiari and the effect that his immigration status is going to have on his family, particularly his two young boys.

I can't -- separating a father from the two young boys -and as to the Government's point that, well, he knew that
before he committed the offense, you can say that in every
single case about every single mitigating circumstance. So
that's just, in my view, not an answer. Because if that were
true, if you always said that, you would never apply a
mitigating factor because in every case you could say, well,
the defendant knew that; he should have thought of that before
he committed the crime.

The crime is done. He's pled guilty. He's accepted responsibility. The question now is, what's an appropriate sentence under all the circumstances?

And I submit that the recommendation that I'm making of 36 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve

1 the goals of sentencing and for him to be able to try to pay 2 some more restitution. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bakhtiari, you have the 3 right to say whatever you would like to say before the Court 4 makes a decision. 5 Please, go ahead. Please. 6 Thank you. 7 THE DEFENDANT: MS. BOERSCH: Do you want to say something to the 8 9 Court? Go ahead. Do you want to? 10 (The defendant conferred with counsel off the record.) 11 12 MS. BOERSCH: Do you want to say something or not? No. I think he's not. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 14 All right. The answer is 54 months in custody followed by 15 three years of supervised release. 16 17 The reason for the departure are largely the reasons given by Ms. Boersch, though, I want to say I think I agree with 18 19 Mr. Kingsley that it's not disparity because the BOP will send 20 someone to a tougher camp or tougher facility than they would a 21 U.S. citizen. The BOP has its own guidelines for presumably 22 good reasons. And those reasons account for the disparity, so 23 it's not a disparity to -- for the BOP to take that into account. 24

Nevertheless, other reasons given by Ms. Boersch, mainly

25

his mental condition and medical condition, as well as the fact that he has made some restitution and in significant amounts, those, in my mind, warrant special consideration.

I do think 54 months will be the minimum time that is needed to satisfy the statutory sentencing factors.

This was a particularly egregious crime that lasted many years, a horrendous breach of trust. It wasn't a one-time event. It wasn't even a five- or six-time event. It was many years of cheating, betraying his employer for no good reason. Not even to feed his family. It was for a lavish lifestyle. So Mr. Kingsley is right, the facts of this case are horrendous.

With respect to immigration consequences, the best you can say is maybe he will be deported and maybe he will be detained in custody. But we don't know that for sure. And a lot can happen between now and the time he comes out of the BOP. So a little bit of the downward departure is based upon that, but it's speculation.

And I'm sure Mr. Bakhtiari will get a good immigration lawyer and figure a way to stay in this country for decades using the same arguments we've heard today.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act, it's the judgment of the Court that Amir Bakhtiari is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 54 months. This consists of 36 months on Count One and 54 months on Count Two,

all concurrent.

Upon release, he will be on supervised release for three years. This is one year on Count One and three on Count Two, all concurrent.

Within 72 hours he must report -- within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the Probation Office in the district to which he is released.

While on supervised release he shall not commit any federal, state, or local crime, shall comply with the standard conditions adopted by the Court except that mandatory drug sentencing is suspended.

Here are additional conditions. You must comply with all of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement regulations, and if you are deported not re-enter the USA without the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

You must not have a fiduciary capacity position without prior permission of Probation.

You must pay restitution and special assessment imposed by the judgment.

You must comply with and cooperate with the IRS in a good-faith effort to pay outstanding tax liability.

You must provide the U.S. Probation Office with a copy of any written and approved agreement with the IRS for the payment of any outstanding tax liability, to include penalty and

interest, within ten days of execution of such agreement.

You must not have any lines of credit without the approval of Probation.

You must provide Probation with access to all financial information they request, including tax returns.

You must submit your person, residence, office, vehicle, electronic devices and their data, including cell phones, computers, and electronic storage media or any other property under your control to a search, to be conducted by U.S. Probation or any law enforcement officer of any type, at any time, with or without suspicion.

You must not have any contact with any codefendant in this case.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by Probation.

Unless directed in writing otherwise, you must check your voice mail and answering machine every day and follow all instructions left by Probation.

You must not own or possess any firearms, ammunition, destructive devices, or other dangerous weapons and must not be present in a vehicle where you know any such thing is present.

It is further ordered that defendant pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200.

The Court finds the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine, so that part is waived.

```
It is further ordered that defendant pay restitution
 1
 2
     totaling $8,062,550 to the victims in this case. Namely, IRS,
 3
     1.44 million, Sonnen Motorcars 6.61 million; total
     8.062 million.
 4
         Any reason why the form of -- oh, all of the matters that
 5
     are listed in the PSR, very long list, all of those are deemed
 6
 7
     forfeited.
                 Agreed?
             MR. KINGSLEY: Except for the house, which has already
 8
    been sold.
 9
              THE COURT: Agreed, Ms. Boersch?
10
             MS. BOERSCH: Agreed, yes. And on the restitution I
11
12
     think it should be joint and several with the other
     codefendants.
13
              THE COURT: Is that correct?
14
             MR. KINGSLEY: I think that's generally true.
15
              THE COURT: All right. So ordered.
16
         And then any other reason why the form of judgment should
17
    not be entered as stated?
18
              MR. KINGSLEY: No, Your Honor.
19
20
             MS. BOERSCH: No, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Ordered.
22
          Is there a plea agreement in this case?
23
              MR. KINGSLEY: There is.
              THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll advise you, you
24
    have 14 days to appeal from the entry of judgment, but you
25
```

```
1
     waived your rights of appeal. I give you that advisement just
 2
     for the record.
 3
         All right, Ms. Boersch.
              MS. BOERSCH: I'd ask for a self-surrender date in
 4
     January so he can spend the time with his family over the
 5
     holidays.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Any objection?
             MR. KINGSLEY: No, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. Let's give you a date.
 9
          How about January 6, 20th floor here or to whatever
10
     facility he is designated.
11
12
             MS. BOERSCH: I would ask for a recommendation to
    Lompoc.
13
              THE COURT: Is that one of those camps you said he
14
15
    wouldn't go to?
16
             MS. BOERSCH: There's a low security facility there.
17
     It's near --
              THE COURT: All right. I will recommend Lompoc.
18
19
     will either report to wherever he's designated or to the 20th
20
     floor of this building on January 6th, by noon.
21
             MS. BOERSCH: His younger son's birthday is
22
     January 10, so could he self-surrender on January 11th?
23
              THE COURT: No, that's too far out. I'm sorry.
24
     some point we've got to let the wheels of justice -- that's too
25
     far out. All right.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. KINGSLEY: Your Honor, one other thing that's in
the judgment is, as part of the agreement, defendant's bond
that he posted in this case gets applied to restitution.
will be ordered in the judgment, but I don't know if it needs
to be spoken on the record.
        MS. BOERSCH: That's fine. We agree to that.
     I assume the Government's going to agree to dismiss the
remaining --
         THE COURT: I'm confused on what you want me to do on
this.
        MR. KINGSLEY: Defendant posted a cash bond when he
was arrested. As a part of the agreement of disposal of
assets, Mr. Bakhtiari agreed that that bond should be applied
to restitution.
                    You both agree. I order that happen.
         THE COURT:
        MR. KINGSLEY: As Ms. Boersch suggested, the
Government moves to dismiss all remaining charges in the
indictment.
        THE COURT:
                    So ordered.
        MS. BOERSCH: Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Good luck, Mr. Bakhtiari.
     (At 9:40 a.m. the proceedings were adjourned.)
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 Katherine Sullivan Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR U.S. Court Reporter